

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

The transcription at page 12 line 1 of "remaininder" has been changed to --remainder-- . Accordingly, the objection to the specification is now moot.

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the specification at page 32 [line 25] - page 33 [line 2]. Claims 7-9, 36-39, 40-43, and 44-47 have been canceled.

Claims 1-6 recite *inter alia* supplying heat for a reforming reaction from a first power generating means.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 7-9, 36-39, 40-43, and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second [alone and with reference to the sixth paragraph of Section 112]. The rejections under 35 USC § 112 are now moot; claims 7-9, 36-39, 40-43, and 44-47 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims over Xu alone or in view of Morimoto et al. or further in view of Gagnon and/or Scheffler.

In applicants' view, the analysis of the U.S. PTO does not appear to establish the differences between the subject matter claimed and the information in the applied references; this determination is one of the elements of the *Graham v. John Deere* investigation. In applicants' view, if the determination required by *Graham v. John Deere* is undertaken, the claims presented herein are patentable. Specifically, in applicants' view, the allegations that certain element(s) "read(s)" on does not appear to be the analysis dictated by the Graham second inquiry. In applicants' view, the claims are patentable.

Per the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the amendment to specification has been edited to include line 25 et seq of Page 11.

Reconsideration and an early allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Marina V. Schneller  
Registration No. 26032  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

Date: March 22, 2007

DC2DOCS1/838389